THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 January 1990

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Administration of oath of office:

George E. Hartman, FAIA.

B. Approval of minutes:

15 November 1989

C. Dates of next meetings:

15 February 1990 (Thursday)
15 March 1990 (Thursday)
17 May 1990 (Thursday)

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. <u>District of Columbia Government, Office of the Mayor</u>

CFA 18/Jan/90-1, National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, Judiciary Square, 400 Block of E Street, N. W. Final drawings and material samples. (Previous: CFA 22/Jun/89-9, CFA 25/May/89-2, CFA 20/Apr/89-2, CFA 23/Feb/89-7, CFA 12/Jan/89-2, CFA 27/Oct/88-1.)

B. <u>Department of the Army, Arlington National Cemetery</u>

CFA 18 Jan/90-2, Memorial to the Soldiers of the Third Infantry Division, Arlington Cemetery, new Memorial Amphitheater. Revised location. (Previous: CFA 26/Jul/89-2.)

C. Department of the Army, Military District of Washington, Fort Myer

1. CFA 18/Jan/90-3, Child Development Center. Addition to building 469, Fort Myer, Virginia. Design.

2. CFA 18/Jan 90-4, Six NCO Family Housing Units. New construction, Ft. Myer, Virginia. Design.

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of Public Works

CFA 18/Jan/90-5, Prototype railing for historic bridges (between road and walk), 16th Street Bridge over Piney Branch. Design.

E. General Services Administration, National Capital Region

1. CFA 18/Jan/90-6, Child Development Center, Federal Trade Commission, 6th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 21/Sept/89-4.)

2. CFA 18/Jan/90-7, Child Development Center, Department of Energy, Forrestal Building, 10th Street and Independence Avenue, S.W. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 26/Jul/89-5.)

3. CFA 18/Jan/90-8, Sidewalk improvement for the Old Executive Office Building, Pennsylvania Avenue frontage. Design.

4. CFA 18/Jan/90-9, Exterior lighting for the Department of Justice building, Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues between 9th and 10th Streets, N. W.

F. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 18/Jan/90-10, Kahlil Gibran Memorial, Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Reserve 514, opposite the Embassy of Great Britain. Proposed sculptural elements. (Previous: CFA 22/Jun/89-10, CFA 23 Feb/89-5.)

2. CFA 18/Jan/90-11, Washington Monument Grounds, 15th Street and Constitution Avenue, N. W. Proposed alterations. (Previous: CFA 21/Feb/86-1.)

G. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Engraving and Printing

CFA 18/Jan/90-12, Main building at 14th and C Streets, S. W. Facade modifications. Concept design.

H. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 90-49, 10 G Street, N. E. New office building. Permit.

b. S.L. 90-52, 2356 & 2346 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W. Infill addition. Concept design.

c. Appendix I.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. Appendix II.

3. Confirmation of December 1989 Appendices for Old Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce Actions.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 90-41	25 Louisiana Avenue, N.W. Teamsters National Headquarters Buildings Corporation	Flagpole - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 50 foot high flagpole mounted on ground.

S.L. 90-42 HPA. 90-196	515 D Street, N.W. District of Columbia Recorder of Deeds building	Handicapped access ramp - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed handicapped access ramp.

S.L. 90-43 HPA. 90-203	200 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Chevron U.S.A, Inc. Gas station	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign mounted on brick base.

S.L. 90-45	2400 N Street, N.W. Carnegie Institute Carnegie International Center	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed sign.

S.L. 90-46	2601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. F. Onacewicz / E. Kierman Long Foster Realtors	Awning - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the two proposed 10'-0" awnings as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 9 January 1990.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 90-53	510 21st Street, N.W. Potomac Park Ltd. Part. Apartment building	Alterations to entrance - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to entrance.

S.L. 90-54 HPA. 90-222	Calvert Street Bridge, N.W. Duke Ellington Bridge	Reconstruction of bridge - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to and reconstruction of bridge.

S.L. 90-14	Poplar and East Beach Drive, N.W. DAK Properties Two single family dwellings	New houses - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case was withdrawn by applicant.

S.L. 90-21	5405 16th Street, N.W. Shirley D. Duhaney Institutional	Rear addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed rear addition providedd visibility from 16th Street is restricted by a 7'-0" high wood fence and 5'-6' evergreen trees planted as shown and specified in supplemental drawings. Brick should match existing brick on main house.

S.L. 90-44	1400 22nd Street, N.W. Chevron U.S.A., Inc. Gas station	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed sign mounted on limestone or cast stone base.

S.L. 90-48	2301 N Street, N.W. Boston Properties Emerson House	Temporary construction sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed 3' by 8' sign.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 89-246 HPA. 90-1009	3114 R Street, N.W. Martha Johns Residence	New Building - revised -conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for new garage structure with mansard roof as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 27 December 1989. Submit working drawings and material samples for permit review when ready.

O.G. 90-11 HPA. 90-70	3315 N Street, N.W. Mr. and Mrs. Donald Chapin Residence	Rear addition -revised design -permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for rear addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 20 December 1989. Brick shall match existing house.

O.G. 90-29 HPA. 90-159	3208-10 Volta Place, N.W. Jack Y. Matthews Residence	Three-story rear addition -conceptual

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST concept as submitted. Proposed three-story addition of wall-to-wall and floor-to-ceiling glass with balconies is not appropriate to the character of the existing residences or to the historic district. Recommend restudy and resubmission with addition confined to basement and first floor only and in a character more compatible with the existing houses.

O.G. 90-35 HPA 90-117	3315 N Street, N.W. Mr. and Mrs. Donald Chapin Residence	A/C unit on roof - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for rooftop compressor provided it is located so as not to be visible from street or alley.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-38 HPA. 90-178	2719 Dumbarton St., N.W. Barbara Owen Residence	Rear addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for rear addition with copper roof and wood siding. (Composition siding is not approved.)

O.G. 90-41 HPA. 90-190	2700 O Street, N.W. Mr. and Mrs. Peter Hannaford Residence	Conservatory addition above garage - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed conservatory addition.

O.G. 90-27 HPA. 90-145	2817 Q Street, N.W. John N. Palmer Residence	Alterations to openings and steps - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for rear wall and front stair alterations.

O.G. 90-44 HPA. 90-199	1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W. 1055 Thomas Jefferson Associates Chelsea's	Signs - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for signs.

O.G. 90-42 HPA. 90-191	3350 M Street, N.W. Forrest Marbury House Associates Limited Partnership	Signs - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for sign program for building with <u>one</u> sign only for "Valentino". Recommend removal of existing oversized real estate banners which were not submitted for permit review. Note is made that the existing west entrance portico was installed without review as required by the Georgetown Act. Request submission of this element for review.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-31 HPA. 90-163	3229 M Street, N.W. Mamie Papa Michale The Market	Sign (existing) - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for existing sign.

O.G. 90-34 HPA. 90-168	2901 M Street, N.W. Citibank	Sign - permit

ACTION: Recommend AGAINST issuance of permit for proposed signs. Sign which features statement "24-hour banking" constitutes an itemization of services, and is not recommended. Sidewall sign is not recommended. Resubmit for a single line replacement sign on front of building with individual brass letters no larger than 12 inches in height.

O.G. 90-43 HPA. 90-167	1667 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Harvey and Bess Littleton Maurine Littleton Gallery	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for sign.

O.G. 90-48 HPA. 90-204	1667 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Harvey and Bess Littleton Maurine Littleton Gallery	Fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for fence. (Note: in compliance with Georgetown Act, owner has been requested to submit application for existing rooftop A/C unit which is visible from public space.)

O.G. 90-33 HPA. 90-167	1338 29th Street, N.W. Janet Capazo Residence	Fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for fence as shown in drawings received and dated 6 December 1989. Fence will be white.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-37 HPA. 90-177	2500 Q Street, N.W. David McFall Apartment building	Replace window - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for replacement bathroom window.

O.G. 90-15 HPA. 90-103	1647 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. David Dikerson Concord Cleaners	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for a six-month temporary permit for a sign on face of projecting bay window pending review and approval of design for new sign. Recommend a free-standing, pole-mounted sign similar to one which previously was on site.

O.G. 90-26 HPA. 90-144	2723 N Street, N.W. Allen R. Cross Residence	Rear addition - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed addition will not be visible from public space.

O.G. 90-36 HPA. 90-204	1667 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Harvey and Bess Littleton Maurine Littleton Gallery	Alterations to rear wall - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for rear wall alterations.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TOUR 18 JANUARY 1990

START: 8:00A.M. at CFA Office, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., D.C.

Arlington Cemetery, via 15th Street past Washington Monument, and 14th Street past Bureau of Printing and Engraving. Inspect Third Division Memorial site.

Fort Myer, inspect site for child care center and six proposed new houses.

Federal Trade Commission, via Constitution Ave. to Sixth Street, to inspect site for proposed child care center.

North Capitol and G Streets, N.E., new office building site.

F Street, 400 Block, N.W., next to Pension Building, site of National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

5th and H Streets, N.W., site of proposed new office building.

Return to Commission office.

In attendance:

Members
J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Carolyn Deaver
George Hartman
Neil Porterfield
Diane Wolf

Staff
Donald Myer

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

Pension Building, Suite 312
Judiciary Square
Washington, D.C. 20001

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 January 1990

The meeting was convened at 10:25 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D. C. after a tour of project sites.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Neil J. Porterfield, Vice-Chairman Hon. Carolyn J. Deaver Hon. George E. Hartman Hon. Diane Wolf
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Mr. Jose Martinez-Canino
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Patrick Tribe

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Administration of oath of office. The Secretary administered the oath of office to architect George E. Hartman, FAIA, and the Chairman and other members welcomed him as a new member of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Chairman noted that the Commission had another new member, Adele Chatfield-Taylor, who was not able to be present at the meeting, owing to a long-standing commitment to the Getty's international historic preservation committee.

B. Approval of the minutes of the 15 November 1989 meeting. Miss Wolf pointed out a typographical error on page 2, noting that "1989" should read "1985". The error will be corrected. With this change the minutes were unanimously approved.

C. Dates of next meetings, approved as:

15 February 1990 (Thursday)
15 March 1990 (Thursday)

The Secretary noted that the May meeting, scheduled tentatively for the 17th (the Commission's 80th anniversary) would have to be moved because of a conflict; the Chairman suggested that a new date not be set for another month or so.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. District of Columbia Government, Office of the Mayor

CFA 18/JAN/90-1, National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, Judiciary Square, 400 block of E Street, N.W. Final drawings and material samples. (Previous: CFA 22/JUN/89-9, CFA 25/MAY/89-2, CFA 20/APR/89--2, CFA 23/FEB/89-7, CFA 12/JAN/89-2, CFA 27/OCT/88-1.) Staff member Jeffrey Carson noted that this was the seventh review of the project and recalled that the design had been approved in June 1989. He said construction drawings were not yet available because Metro officials were still objecting to the cladding of the Metro elevators on the site. By letter they had stated that any variation from the standard appearance would compromise the identity Metro had worked so hard to establish and be confusing to people using the system; another objection, involving the memorial as a whole, was that any large assembly of people on the site might be dangerous to those trying to reach the elevators or escalators. Mr. Carson noted that there had been a letter from the National Organization on Disability to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund saying that the organization foresaw no problems for the disabled arising from the cladding.

Architect Davis Buckley and Craig Floyd, chairman of the Memorial Fund, were introduced. Mr. Floyd showed photographs of the existing elevators and the final design for cladding them so that they would be more compatible with the other elements of the memorial. He said many of the officers who would visit the site would be disabled, and the elevators would be their first impression of the memorial. He then read the letter from the National Organization on Disability.

Mr. Buckley reviewed the design of the memorial, showing slides of the model and various drawings, including one of the proposed cladding for the elevators. Granite, like that used

elsewhere in the memorial, would be used around the base and to frame the door; the rest of the structure would be covered in metal with a light-colored, semi-matte finish. There would be a metal lattice pattern over the glass areas at the sides. Mr. Buckley also pointed out that the profile of the stone bench along the path of remembrance had changed slightly.

In answer to a question from Mrs. Deaver, Mr. Buckley said this would be the first time a Metro elevator had been altered, although it was pointed out many were incorporated in existing buildings. The Chairman commented that the elevators really needed to harmonize with the two diagonally disposed gazebos that would be erected, to balance them on the site. Miss Wolf asked about the height of the elevators and was told it would remain the same, that it could not be reduced because of the override. Mr. Buckley said the signage would not be altered, but the lighting would be enhanced somewhat. The Chairman thought that if there was still a question about identifying the elevators, a sign could be placed near the escalator.

There were no further questions or discussion, and no objections to the cladding, its design, or the materials proposed. Mr. Porterfield moved that the Commission give its approval, leaving the question of WMATA's objections to be worked out between that agency and the Memorial Fund. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Exhibit A

B. Department of the Army, Arlington National Cemetery.

CFA 18/JAN/90-2, Memorial to the Soldiers of the Third Infantry Division, Arlington Cemetery, near Memorial Amphitheatre. Revised location. (Previous: CFA 26/JUL/89-2.) The Assistant Secretary recalled that during the previous review there had been no objections to the design, but the location had been considered inappropriate because of its proximity to the uniform rows of headstones in the cemetery. He said an alternate site was now under consideration, and then introduced architect Donald Lethbridge. The Chairman told Mr. Lethbridge that the members had seen the site during their pre-meeting inspection tour and had been pleased with it; he said their only concern had been that in placing the cenotaph, care would have to be taken to ensure that, when viewed from the steps of the Amphitheatre, it would not line up exactly with the Canadian Cross behind it. Mr. Hartman said he thought it would just miss, but might be moved slightly to the right so as to be sure. Mr. Lethbridge said he did not think the sight lines would be a problem as those viewing the two memorials from the steps would probably not be standing still. Mr. Lethbridge showed drawings, pointing out that the granite on the upper part would be light grey and relatively smooth, while that on the lower section would be darker and more roughly finished. He said the polished shaft would be a single piece of granite, or

if that proved to be too expensive, a six-inch veneer would be used. General Ramsay, from the Third Infantry Division, was present at the meeting; he said he was very pleased with both the site and design. The Commission members agreed and unanimously approved the project. Exhibit B

C. Department of the Army, Military District of Washington, Fort Myer

1. CFA 18/JAN/90-3, Child Development Center. Addition to Building 469, Fort Myer, Virginia. Design. The Assistant Secretary said the next two submissions concerned Fort Myer, and he noted that the members had visited both sites prior to the meeting. Mr. Carson said the Child Development Center submission involved an addition to an existing building, part of which was now used for the Center; he said the design would follow that of the older building. He thought the siting whould be addressed, noting that the building was in the middle of a parking lot, next to a dry-cleaning pick-up building.

Jack Webb, from the Army, was introduced to answer the members' questions. Mr. Hartman said he did not think the site was an appropriate one for young children, considering the traffic and general surroundings; he asked why the facility could not be moved elsewhere. If it could not be moved, would it be possible to obtain use of the entire building rather than build an addition? Mr. Porterfield asked about the master plan for the area and wondered if there was any good reason why the child care facility had to be in this location.

Mr. Webb said the number of sites at Fort Myer was limited; he added that he did not think either the dry-cleaning building or the school building would remain for any length of time. He said the new addition would allow the present uses to continue and enable one hundred or more children to be accommodated. He said the present capacity is about seventy or eighty.

There were no objections to the design of the addition, and it was the Chairman's suggestion that it be approved, since the Commission's purview was generally limited to the design; he thought, however, that the letter written to the Army should state the Commission's strong objections to the location of the project. The other members agreed, and the design for the addition was unanimously approved. Exhibit C

2. CFA 18/JAN/90-4, Six NCO family housing units. New construction, Fort Myer, Virginia. Design. The Assistant Secretary commented that the siting for these six attached houses had been changed several times. He said the current proposal was to erect them on a spur road to be built off McNair Road, near the boundary of Arlington Cemetery; he noted there would be a dumpster

site at the end of the road and the houses would face a parking area. After looking at a contour map, Mr. Porterfield said it was evident that a lot of grading would have to be done, destroying the soft, rolling contours and a number of trees. Mr. Webb said he had suggested moving the houses down further so the trees would not be lost. Mr. Hartman asked if more houses would be built in the area. When told by Mr. Webb that it was not likely, Mr. Hartman said he thought the six houses should definitely be moved, and the site reserved for a more carefully planned development--or left in its natural state. Mr. Webb said the Virginia Historic Preservation Board was not happy with the siting, either, and had made several suggestions. Miss Wolf suggested that it would help if trees could be planted on the Fort Myer side of the boundary with the cemetery.

It was unanimously agreed that the Commission could not accept the proposed siting, noting that it would have a negative effect on Arlington Cemetery as well as the open space of Fort Myer; Mr. Webb was asked to bring other options. There were no objections to the design of the houses. Exhibit D

D. District of Columbia Government, Department of Public Works

CFA 18/JAN/90-5, Prototype railing for historic bridges (between road and walk), 16th Street Bridge over Piney Branch. Design. The Assistant Secretary noted that the members had inspected the Q Street bridge in Georgetown during their pre-meeting tour, where they saw a similar railing. He introduced Don Cooney from the D. C. Department of Public Works, who said that after the Q Street railing had been installed, the criteria had changed, and the new design would be stronger and have a slightly different appearance. He said the appearance was important because the 16th Street bridge was eligible for the National Register, and he added that the existing rail, approved by the D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board, was considerably taller than the one being presented at this meeting. He noted that the design had not yet been crash-tested.

The members looked at drawings of the proposed rail, and Mr. Hartman asked why the Q Street railing was no longer acceptable; Mr. Cooney said it was not strong enough at the bottom. Mr. Hartman then asked why the new top rail varied from that on the Q Street Bridge, why it was no longer symmetrical in relation to the vertical members, but projected out farther on the roadway side. Mr. Cooney said the new criteria required that it come out as close to the curb extension as possible. Mr. Hartman thought the appearance had suffered because of this change; he suggested that since the railing had been strengthened in other ways, it would be worthwhile to crash-test it using the Q Street top rail and see if

it would pass. If not, the Commission would have to consider a different solution. The other members agreed this would be the way to proceed, and Mr. Cooney was told that although the concept was approved, the Commission wanted further study along the lines suggested before giving final approval. Exhibit E

E. General Services Administration, National Capital Region

1. CFA 18/JAN/90-6, Child development center, Federal Trade Commission, 6th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 21/SEP/89-4.) (The Chairman, noting his position as director of the National Gallery of Art, recused himself and left the room because of the possibility of Gallery personnel utilizing this project.) Staff member Jose Martinez, recalling the Commission's previous objection to the visibility and type of play equipment proposed for this prominent site, at the apex of the Federal Triangle, introduced John Keczmerski and Diane Savoy from GSA to discuss changes that had been made.

Mr. Keczmerski said the equipment now proposed for the existing play area was lower, and he showed slides from various vantage points, including 1st Street and the Capitol, pointing out that the playground was not visible because of the street trees and planting around the FTC building. Close-up views showed a chain-link fence that enclosed the play area, with the fence partially screened by planting.

Ms. Savoy discussed the specific proposals. She said the play area now accommodated forty-one children, and they would like to add about twenty more. As there was no play equipment, the children were taken to the Mall so that they could engage in more active play, and this required taking them across three streets, including heavily-traveled Constitution Avenue. Once there, there was a concern for their security. For safety and security reasons, therefore, they were requesting the installation of play equipment; as redesigned, she said, the only element visible from the street would be the top of the swing post, 6 feet high. To screen this, a hedge would be allowed to grow 1 foot above the perimeter fence.

Mr. Hartman said he really did not want to see any equipment in the play area; even if it were not visible from the street it could be seen from some rooms in the FTC building and from the upper floors of other buildings in the area. He did not think playground equipment should be visible within the greatest ensemble of Beaux-Arts architecture in the capital. In answer to Ms. Savoy's statement that the equipment was necessary to develop the children's motor skills, he thought that playing with balls and other moveable equipment would accomplish the same thing. Mr. Porterfield said that if the equipment was considered essential, then another site should be chosen for the play area; he did not

think this was a good location anyway because of the traffic and fumes. Miss Wolf thought the site was such an important one in the capital that it was really inappropriate to have child playground equipment there; she also mentioned the air pollution problem.

There was more discussion and a suggestion that the swing be removed. A vote was taken, resulting in a tie, with Miss Wolf and Mr. Hartman dissenting. Further discussion resulted in a request to the GSA representatives to return with another plan for the Commission to study, based on using the minimum amount of moveable equipment, 1-3 feet in height, arranged on the site in an integrated pattern.

Mr. Hartman asked how many more of these play areas GSA was planning to present, whether several agencies could get together and sponsor one playground, and whether they had to be located adjacent to the office buildings. Ms. Savoy said there would be seven or eight more, that in most cases (including this one) there were several agencies involved, and that the question of location for all of them had been thoroughly investigated. Exhibit F

2. CFA 18/JAN/90-7, Child Development Center, Department of Energy, Forrestal Building, 10th Street and Independence Avenue, S.W. Revised design. (Previous: CFA 26/JUL/89-5.) Mr. Martinez recalled the Commission's previous request for further study of the roof, particularly the surface material, and the relocation of the air conditioning equipment to an unobtrusive ground level location. He introduced John Keczmerski to the changes that had been made.

Mr. Keczmerski said the Commission had reviewed the project, the Department of Energy had requested the use of solar shading on the southern windows, which had resulted in the use of a clerestory to provide for mechanical equipment. He said it would make the roof 4 feet higher but would also provide space for the air conditioning equipment, keeping it out of sight. The members looked at the drawings, considered the design of the roof much improved, and unanimously approved it. Exhibit F

3. CFA 18/JAN/90-8, Sidewalk improvement for the Old Executive Office Building, Pennsylvania Avenue frontage. Design. Mr. Martinez introduced Carol Whipple from the National Park Service, who said her agency had been working with GSA on the continuation of this paving project. This submission was for Phase 3, the section in front of the OEOB. The Chairman noted that the members had seen the site, and there were no objections to continuing the paving in this area. Mr. Hartman asked if there were plans to continue the pattern around the Ellipse; if so, he would have reservations about that. Ms. Whipple said there were no such plans at this time. There was no further discussion, and the project was unanimously approved. Exhibit G

4. CFA 18/JAN/90-9, Exterior lighting for the Department of Justice Building, Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues between 9th and 10th Streets, N.W. (Miss Wolf recused herself because of her objection to the Commission's previous administrative handling of the Federal City Lighting Project.) The Secretary recalled that the Commission had approved a lighting scheme for the entire Federal Triangle, and he reported that at this point, only the Justice Department was ready to go ahead with it. Since the other buildings, including the Archives across the street, would remain dark, the question arose as to whether it was advisable to let Justice alone light its building. Mr. Carson showed a rendering of the proposed scheme and said that Pennsylvania Avenue had already been lighted in this manner.

The Secretary said the staff had consulted with all members of the task force, and there had been a mixture of opinion, with some feeling there was merit in having one piece in place. He said he knew the Smithsonian did not have the funds to put their lighting in place for some time, and he thought this was true of other agencies as well. He said it appeared that there was more weight on the side of letting Justice go ahead. Jay Brodie from PADC, one of the task force members, said that he saw the lighting effort as a comprehensive venture among all agencies involved, and he hoped that the Commission would reassert its leadership and get everybody together again; he added, however, that perhaps letting Justice be the first to proceed would be a good way to prod the others. John Parsons, representing the Park Service, said the problem was that GSA had, in many cases, turned over its administrative functions to the individual agencies and was no longer providing the initiative to get this project moving. He was concerned that if the Justice Department was the only Triangle building to be lit it would stand out like a "gold tooth".

Mr. Hartman agreed, feeling that it would be wrong to light the bureaucracy before the monuments: in the case of the Federal Triangle, the Archives building. The members discussed the dilemma, and although there was no clear-cut decision, it was agreed they would not oppose the Justice Department lighting, feeling that the approved plan had to begin somewhere, and might help motivate the adjoining agencies to follow suit. It was also agreed that GSA should be strongly urged to press the other agencies into compliance. Exhibit H

F. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 18/JAN/90-10, Kahlil Gibran Memorial, Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Reserve 514, opposite the Embassy of Great Britain. Proposed sculptural elements. Staff member Sue Kohler reviewed the history of this project, recalling that the site had been approved in July 1987, the preliminary design in February 1989, and the final design in June 1989, with the

recommendation that the flowering plants be limited to white or pastel colors so as not to conflict with the subtle shades of the stones forming the Islamic patterns in the lower and upper terraces. She said this suggestion had been taken, and the only element left to be reviewed was the relief sculpture, intended for the three-foot wall behind the water element on the lower, entrance terrace. She noted the presence of David Sherman from the Park Service, Pamela Brannon from the architectural firm, HOK, the sculptor, Gordon Kray, and Sheryl Amin, from the Kahlil Gibran Foundation. Ms. Amin was asked to make the presentation.

Ms. Amin said the philosophy of the memorial had always been to present Kahlil Gibran in literal terms at the entrance terrace, in the form of a bust and inscriptions, with the focus of the memorial being at the upper terrace, where his message would be interpreted in more symbolic terms. She said the sculptor had prepared a sketch model of the design concept for the Commission to react to, before they proceeded to the next step, which would be a half-scale model. She then introduced sculptor Gordon Kray.

Mr. Kray said he had decided to treat the whole back wall as a background for the relief, giving ample space in which to place the elements so that a feeling of balance, rhythm, and peacefulness could be achieved; Mr. Kray noted that these were qualities stressed by Gibran in his work. The elements would be almost free-standing: a bust of Gibran, a garland of leaves and flowers native to Lebanon, indicating his status as a poet, and three doves perched on water spouts, the last in the process of flying off to the upper terrace of the memorial. The doves would connote peace and recall the symbolism of wings, a constant element in Gibran's work. The material would be bronze, with patinas ranging from the traditional oxidized bronze, to black, to a whitish-grey for the doves. There would also be inscriptions on the wall; some brief biographical information and an all-inclusive quote that would summarize Gibran's message. Mr. Kray talked about the expansive nature of his design and the way it would lead the visitor through the sculptural elements and up the path toward the upper terrace, the focus of the memorial.

The Chairman said he found the sculpture charming, and appropriate to the texture and the lightness of the memorial. There was general agreement on this, with several reservations. Mr. Porterfield was not sure the bust of Gibran was necessary, given the many symbols of the man and his work present in the memorial. Ms. Amin said she understood his point, and that was the reason the bust had been placed in a subordinate position; however, she said she felt Gibran "ought to have a face", that people needed to know what he looked like. Mr. Hartman was concerned with the size of the doves in relation to the size of Gibran's head; he commented that the doves, rather than the man, looked monumental. Miss Wolf thought the bust might be more

effective if it were raised slightly. Mr. Kray said these were all things that had occurred to him as he worked on the model, and they needed more study.

With the request that Mr. Kray work on the scale of the doves and the placing of the bust, the concept design was approved unanimously. Exhibit I

2. CFA 18/JAN/90-11, Washington Monument Grounds, 15th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W. Proposed alterations. (Previous: CFA 21/FEB/86-1.) Mr. Carson recalled the first presentation for redevelopment of the monument grounds, in 1986, when the Commission reviewed a master plan and disapproved a 280-foot-long restaurant and concession stand at the northeast corner of the grounds, on 15th Street; there were also questions about a new alignment of 15th Street, the treatment of the base of the monument, and the means of egress for people alighting from tour buses. He said the Park Service had returned with a revised plan that eliminated the restaurant, substituting a modestly-sized visitor facility behind the existing Sylvan Theatre, concealed by trees; it also provided for a realignment of 15th Street that kept the curved form, simplified the treatment of the base of the monument, provided a new path system, and called for the elimination of the existing parking lot that divided the German-American Friendship Garden.

Park Service representative John Parsons was then introduced. He said Mr. Carson had covered the main points, and he asked if there were any questions he could answer. On the whole, the members found the new plan a great improvement, especially in regard to the scaled-down and relocated visitor facility. Mr. Hartman was curious as to where the curve in 15th Street had come from and was told by Mr. Parsons that it was a remnant of the mid-19th century Mall plan by A. J. Downing. Mr. Hartman also asked about the size of the "coffins" containing the lights at the base of the monument. The Chairman added that another question to be answered was their location vis-a-vis the ring of flags; he recalled the previous discussion about the shadows cast by the waving flags if the light boxes were placed outside the ring. Mr. Parsons said the boxes were not particularly large, but they were still being studied, and he knew that the Commission preferred to eliminate the shadows on the monument cast by the flags; he added that some people liked them.

Miss Wolf was concerned about the layout of the paths, noting that it was not possible to go straight from the Mall roads to the monument itself. She thought that diverting the paths to direct people to the new visitor and staging area would cause those who just wanted to see the monument to cut across planted areas. Mr. Parsons said it was important to get people to the staging point so they would know how to visit the monument, but he said they

WASHINGTON MONUMENT GROUNDS

SUB AREA PLAN

WASHINGTON D.C.

CFA 18 January 90-11
Washington Monument Grounds
Master Plan

would reexamine the path layout; he said they did not want to get into the position of having to put up fences to keep people from wearing unwanted paths. The Chairman and Mr. Porterfield agreed that the main objective was to get people to the visitor facility; they thought that those going directly to the monument would have no problem following a path around a group of trees and would probably not be tempted to walk through them.

There was further discussion about the walks and the alignment of 15th Street, with Mr. Hartman asking what the time frame was for completing the realignment, noting that the walks and paving would depend on it. Mr. Parsons said it would be completed within the next five years.

Miss Wolf made a motion that the concept design be approved, with further study given to the walkways to the monument; the motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Exhibit J

G. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Engraving and Printing

CFA 18/JAN/90-12, Main building at 14th and C Streets, S.W. Facade modifications. Concept design. Mr. Carson said this would be a four-phase project, and each phase would be reviewed in detail as it came along. He said it would include a number of changes, including a new plaza that would be level with 14th Street and make a better connection with the main visitors entrance. He said that when the building was erected, in 1914, the ground floor was level with 14th Street, but the street was subsequently raised, creating a moat and making necessary the construction of a bridge to reach the entrance. The new plaza would improve the appearance of the 14th Street facade, make it more visitor-friendly, and bring it into conformance with the entrance to the soon-to-be-built Holocaust Museum next door.

Anthony DiSilvestre from the Treasury Department was introduced, and he in turn introduced several other people from the department who had been working on the project. Mr. DiSilvestre described the other phases of the project, noting first the increasing demand for paper money, all of it printed at the Washington facility. He said new technology and printing equipment made necessary additional pollution abatement equipment under the Clean Air and Water Act; this would include a waste water treatment plant and other abatement devices which could not be accommodated within the building and would have to be placed in the courtyards. He said the construction of these facilities was urgent and had been funded.

Paul Reilly then discussed the new additions in detail, pointing them out on drawings. They would be screened by iron fencing in a historic design to harmonize with the building. The

structure at the visitors entrance would also be harmonious in style. Mr. Reilly commented on the large number of tourists who visited the bureau, a number he expected would increase with the construction of the Holocaust Museum; he talked about ways to bring them into the building, space for tour bus drop-off, and the enhancement of the street front with flowering trees in containers. The final project discussed by Mr. Reilly was the enlargement of an employee cafeteria on the roof of one of the wings. He said funding was available immediately for the pollution abatement facilities, and for the visitors entrance and plaza in the next two years.

Mr. Hartman commented that, visually, it was very important that the plaza level not cut off the bases of the pilasters on the facade of the building. Mr. DiSilvestre said that issue had also been raised by the Planning Commission. Mr. Hartman also had some comments on the design of the proposed cafeteria addition, saying that it was important to keep the symmetrical appearance, and there were questions asked about the parking and the handicapped entrance. The members realized, however, that this was only a concept submission and details of all phases would be brought in for review. In the interest of moving the urgent projects along and in the absence of any serious objections, the stone and wrought-iron fence to screen the pollution abatement equipment was unanimously approved; the concept design for the other phases was also unanimously approved. Exhibits K, K-1

H. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 90-49, 10 G Street, N.E. New office building. Permit. Before the presentation began, Miss Wolf asked the applicant who the developer was. She was told it was the Weihe Partnership with the Richmarr Construction Company. The Chairman recused himself from consideration of this project.

The Assistant Secretary said the members had seen the site on their pre-meeting tour. He pointed it out on a map, on North Capitol and G Streets, next to the Government Printing Office Warehouse on North Capitol and across the street from the main GPO building. He located the old City Post Office on the other side of G Street and Union Station in the immediate vicinity. He said the project included the removal of several small buildings on the site.

Architect Roger Strassman was introduced to make the presentation. He said the site was long and narrow, and the building had been planned with a central core and main entrance on G Street, emphasized with a bay element; there would also be a

slight bow on the narrow North Capitol Street facade. He pointed out on drawings the projections, metal railings, and the stress on verticality that had been used to break up the long G Street facade. He said the design had to relate to two large and quite different neighbors--the red brick GPO building and the limestone Old City Post Office. To help accomplish this, limestone would be used up to the second floor, the main center section would be a rosy-red brick, with a light-color precast concrete at the top. Mr. Strassman said he did not want to repeat the dark red brick of the GPO building because the contrast would be too great. Although there would be no retail in the building, awnings would be used on the first floor to add color and give a sense of lightness. Sidewalks would be scored concrete with accents of brick; at the entrance, granite paving would be used. There would be landscaping along the North Capitol frontage.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield asked the members for their comments. Mr. Hartman questioned the placement of the mullions in certain windows, and then asked to see a section so that he could see what was producing the shadow lines apparent in a rendering Mr. Strassman had brought along. After looking at the sections, he said they showed a much flatter building than portrayed in the rendering, and he was concerned. He noted that both the GPO and Post Office buildings had well-articulated, plastic facades, and he thought this building was too flat to relate to them well, particularly in the upper portions. He suggested recessing the windows more, to add depth, and letting the massing reinforce the material changes with projections or setbacks. He was also concerned about the appearance of the building when coming down North Capitol, a gateway to the city, with the Capitol just a few blocks ahead; from the drawings it appeared that the part of the rear (north) elevation that was visible was not articulated as much as the other facades of the building.

Mr. Strassman said he did not think of the building as lacking in articulation, and, in fact, had tried to avoid a flat appearance. In regard to the rear facade, he said that from their studies he was reasonably sure that any part that was visible was articulated in the same way as the rest of the building. He told the Commission his firm had already prepared a full set of working drawings, because they had not been aware that the building required review until they started work on the streetscape plans and were so advised.

Mr. Porterfield said he did not have major concerns, but he, too, would like to see more articulation and was not sure the bay on the end elevation did anything for the street or the nearby buildings. He said he had no objection to the materials or the color change; he thought the red brick helped relieve the long, narrow configuration. Miss Wolf did not like the brick; she thought that since the building would be located at the approach

to the Federal City, it should be white. She noted a new building in the next block that was light in color and suggested that Mr. Strassman rethink his color and material choice. Mr. Strassman said the building referred to by Miss Wolf had not been built when he was designing his building.

Vice-Chairman Porterfield suggested that it was time for a motion. Miss Wolf moved that permit approval be denied but concept approval given, with the request that further study be given to the fenestration and articulation, and to the color. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion, and it was carried unanimously. Exhibit L

b. S.L. 90-52, 2356 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Infill addition. Concept design. (The Chairman recused himself during the review of this project.) Mr. Carson described the site, noting that it was in the Massachusetts Avenue Historic District, and said the D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board had approved the addition. The ANC had also approved it, except for the treatment of the front courtyard along Massachusetts Avenue; there were objections to the amount of paving, the loss of green space, and the possibility of parking four to six cars in the space. Mr. Carson said that since the ANC review, the architect had revised the design. He showed a photograph of the existing house, a neighboring house to the west, which the applicant had purchased, and the side garden between, which would be the site for the addition. He said the addition was designed to appear as a separate townhouse. Architect Leon Chatelain was then introduced to describe the project in more detail.

Mr. Chatelain said the main house was a 50-foot-wide Georgian Revival structure designed in 1905-06 by Washington architects Wood, Donn & Deming. The adjacent property, including a side yard and late Victorian house, was also 50 feet wide, making a 100-foot frontage along the avenue. In order to break up the long frontage and preserve the traditional streetscape of the area, the addition had been given the appearance of a separate townhouse; in style, it would be compatible with both existing houses, relating to the architecture of the period between 1895 and 1925.

Mr. Chatelain said the granite cobblestone courtyard in front of the Georgian house would be extended to the addition, with an expanded green space between that and the parking in front of the Victorian residence; one curb-cut would be removed. In the rear there was an unusual lot configuration, bringing a wedge of Rock Creek Park into what would normally be part of the private lot. To simplify and straighten out the back garden area, he was proposing to remove two rear additions to the Victorian house, adjust the fenestration and add a three-story bay window.

Mr. Hartman said he had no problem with the architectural design and the concept of making the addition look like a separate

S.L. 90-52
2346 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Addition to existing residence

architecturally was united on the site plan by the landscaping treatment and the extension of the paving and fencing along the entire frontage. Mr. Porterfield agreed, thinking that the ensemble should not be made more pretentious; he suggested changing hedge heights and not expanding the existing length of wall and fence. He and Mr. Hartman gave Mr. Chatelain more specific suggestions on how he might proceed with the landscaping and fencing, entrances into the property, and the parking of cars. Mr. Chatelain observed that since both houses would now be used by just one owner, the number of cars parked in the courtyard would seldom exceed two.

There was no further discussion, and the concept design was approved except for the front courtyard arrangement, which Mr. Chatelain was requested to restudy. Exhibit L

c. Appendix I. The Chairman explained that the Appendix contained minor submissions that had been taken care of by the staff; they were routinely reviewed by the members at the monthly meetings. There were no questions about the items on this appendix, and it was unanimously approved.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. Appendix II. Approved.

3. Confirmation of December 1989 appendices for Old Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce actions. The Secretary commented that these were the November appendices, circulated by mail to the members in December when it was determined that there would be no meeting in December. The Chairman explained to Mr. Hartman that the Commission had only thirty days to render a decision on submissions made to it; lacking that, its recommendations were null and void. If there was no scheduled meeting during that period, the canvasing was done by mail, but had to be ratified at the next regular meeting. Miss Wolf stated for the record that she had not responded to the Secretary's memo asking for a vote on the appendices because it was inappropriate to do so except in cases of emergency. She said she had taken the same action in reference to the August 1989 agenda. The Chairman said there was an emergency, which was the time limit for Commission response. Miss Wolf said, "As Don Myer was quoted in the 5 January issue of City Paper as saying the December meeting was cancelled - quote - for lack of business, it seemed to me that these cases are not cases of emergency, and I just wish to be on record to note that I am on record regarding this." A majority of the members had approved the appendices by mail, however, and they were considered ratified at this meeting. EXHIBIT M

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Fawcett:

During the meeting of 18 January 1990, the Commission discussed the final design scheme for the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial to be located on Judiciary Square. The members note that between October 1988 and January of this year the project has been reviewed seven times. In each case, the architect and his client have responded admirably to the recommendations of the Commission. As a result, the members convey their unanimous support of the memorial as designed.

It was with regret that the Commission learned via letter dated 8 January 1990 that WMATA was not prepared to approve recladding the two existing elevator houses within the middle of the site. The Commission appreciates the concerns of WMATA with respect to accessibility by the handicapped and applauds the care taken to safeguard the needs of the disabled. As such, it was with a sense of relief that the Commission received a copy of the letter addressed to John McElhenny from Alan Reich, President of the National Organization on Disability, praising the memorial design and, in particular, the proposed recladding of the elevator houses as recommended by the architect. It would seem that this testimonial from Mr. Reich's organization is just what WMATA needs to justify approval of the memorial in its entirety.

The Commission looks forward to review of the working drawings, material samples and planting schedule at the earliest convenience of the memorial representatives. With respect to the anticipated addition of sculptural elements, concept proposals should be submitted for consideration at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Arthur H. Fawcett, Jr., Chairman
Mayor's Advisory Council on Memorials
Department of Recreation, Government of the District of Columbia
3149 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20010

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT B

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Costanzo:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on 18 January 1990 approved the Third Infantry Division Memorial, to be located between the Memorial Amphitheater and the Canadian Peace Cross. The design of the obelisk is appropriate and, if it can be a single shaft of granite, that would be excellent, though we have no objection to a veneer. Our one suggestion is that the actual siting of the memorial not be on a straight line between the Canadian Peace Cross and the Amphitheater entrance, causing the two memorials to be superimposed visually. Shifting it a few feet to the north would be all that is required. The site of the existing tree slated for removal would be fine.

We thank you for your efforts in working with us, and your kindness in showing us around the cemetery. We also appreciate the cooperation of the Third Division Memorial Association and the architect in finding such a successful site.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

R. J. Costanzo, Superintendent
Department of the Army
Arlington National Cemetery
Arlington, Virginia 22211-5003

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT C

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Kennon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on January 18, 1990, reviewed plans for a new day-care center designed as an addition to building 469 at Fort Myer. The members had a chance to visit the site prior to the meeting and see first hand the conditions of the site.

Unfortunately, they were not impressed with what they saw. Apparently the center is to be located in the midst of an area occupied by a gas station and dry cleaning plant, hardly the ideal setting for the care of young children.

As it happens, a strict interpretation of the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts leads us to conclude that the use of this new addition is not within our purview, which is essentially restricted to matters of architectural design. The design of this addition, in fact, is not a problem, being no more than a modest extension of what is already there. However, the site appears to be a problem, and we urge you to take another look at alternative locations that would be a more appropriate setting for the care of pre-school children.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Herbert H. Kennon, Chief
Engineering Division
Directorate of Military Programs
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT D

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Kennon:

The Commission of Fine Arts cannot approve the location for six new houses as proposed for the periphery of Fort Myer along McNair Drive.

Two of the most valuable assets of Fort Myer are its historic structures and its open space, which in turn enhance the adjacent Arlington Cemetery. The plan for the houses, as reviewed at the Commission's 18 January meeting, would cut into the topography and tree cover, destroying a large and beautiful site which should either be devoted to a substantial, carefully planned development, or left in its natural state.

We regret any inconvenience this decision may cause, knowing how long the Army has been working to find a place for these units; however, the location is in violation of the approved master plan as well as the Commission's long-standing policy regarding the preservation of Fort Myer's unique character.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Herbert H Kennon, Chief
Engineering Division
Directorate of Military Programs
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army
Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT E

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Burch:

The Commission approved the concept of a prototype railing for historic bridges, with some reservation, at its 18 January 1990 meeting. After having another look at the rail on the Q Street Bridge, we feel that a more symmetrical relationship of the new guard rail to its posts is worth another look. The Q Street rail has a very successful profile, one which should be used as a guide for the new design. We are delighted that the bigger two-rail system is not being pursued, and we feel that the project is on the right track, subject to some further study.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Gary A. Burch, Chief
Bureau of Transportation
Construction Services
2000 14th Street, N.W., 5th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20009

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT F

25 January 1990

Dear Mr. Handley:

The Commission of Fine Arts met on 18 January 1990 and reviewed the revised designs for two Child Development Centers; one for the Department of Energy at the Forrestal Building, near Independence Avenue and 10th Street, S.W.; the other for the Federal Trade Commission at the intersection of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues at 6th Street, N.W..

The Commission commends the use of energy conservation and renewable technologies at the Department of Energy center, both to create a lively roofscape and to provide a symbolic link with the agency it serves.

On the other hand, the members were not able to reach a consensus on the proposal for the Federal Trade Commission. Deep reservations remain as to the appropriateness of locating a playground on this site, both with respect to the health of the children as well as the special nature of the monumental setting itself. However, recognizing that a day care center already exists at the Federal Trade Commission, there seems little alternative to approving the playground provided that all equipment is concealed from public view and is temporary in nature. In time, we would hope that a more suitable location could be found for the long-term operation.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James Handley
Regional Administrator
General Services Administration
National Capital Region
Washington, D.C. 20407

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT G

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Duvall:

During the meeting of 18 January 1990, the Commission of Fine Arts met with Mr. Robert Andrukonis from GSA, Mr. Don Porter from Vincent Chan and Assoc., Inc., and Mrs. Carol Whipple from the National Park service and reviewed the proposal to extend the Landscape and Sidewalk Improvement Program along the frontage of the Old Executive Office Building.

The project, which utilizes the same elements previously approved by the Commission, will complete the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue from 15th Street to 17th Street, N.W.. So far, the Commission has been satisfied with the appearance of the Avenue's paving, landscape and sidewalk furniture, and looks forward to the completion of a unified scheme.

We realize this is only the third phase of a much larger master plan which encompasses the President's Park, and will be happy to review future phases as they develop.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Garner W. Duvall
Chief, Professional Services Branch
General Services Administration
National Capital Region
Washington, D. C. 20407

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT H

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Handley:

During its meeting on 18 January 1990, the Commission reviewed plans for lighting the 9th and 10th Street elevations and the Constitution Avenue facade of the Department of Justice Building in the Federal Triangle. The members understand that the new lighting elements will match the existing system recently installed on the Pennsylvania Avenue elevation, although as you may know that lighting is still in the process of being fine-tuned with respect to color and intensity.

Apart from these remaining refinements, we already approved the new lighting scheme for Constitution Avenue and the adjoining side streets in June 1988. The only problem is that when this action was taken, it was assumed that the lighting would be uniformally implemented for the entire Triangle at the same time and not accomplished in a piecemeal fashion over some indefinite period. The vision of one or two office buildings glowing with illumination on an otherwise darkened avenue is not a satisfactory one, especially when one of the offices happens to be next to a national shrine like the Archives.

Our first inclination, therefore, was to hold off on approving the Justice Department installation until such time as all the other parts of the system were ready to go. However, from a more pragmatic approach, it appeared to make sense to approve moving ahead with the Justice Department, with the understanding that other agencies would be leaned upon heavily to follow suit as soon as possible.

From time to time we have convened a small task group to coordinate lighting in the monumental core, and it is the Commission's feeling the time is ripe to do so again. In this regard we would appreciate your designating someone from GSA to serve on this panel. Other members include NCPC, Smithsonian, the Architect of the Capitol, National Park Service and PADC.

Please have your designee call the Secretary of the Commission, Charles Atherton, so we can schedule a meeting in the near future.

Meanwhile, it might be a good idea to check in with PADC and their consultant to find out where they are with respect to making final adjustments to the lighting on Pennsylvania Avenue. We want to be sure that there is compatibility between all phases of the work.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James Handley
Regional Administrator
General Services Administration
National Capital Region
Washington, D.C. 20407

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT I

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Stanton:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed a sketch model for relief sculpture at the Kahlil Gibran Memorial at its 18 January meeting. We are happy to tell you that the concept was approved, and we feel that the sculpture will truly enhance the memorial.

As the sculptor, Gordon Kray, agreed, further study needs to be done on the exact size and placement of the portrait bust and the other elements. We are looking forward to seeing the half-scale model when it is ready.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert Stanton, Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT J

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. Stanton:

At its meeting on January 18, 1990, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the revised master plan for the Washington Monument grounds. I am happy to report that the members were very pleased with the new concept and approved the plan as presented. As this is probably the single most important piece of landscape in the national park system, I think it would be worthwhile to enumerate the major points of the plan in some detail:

o Relocation of a new visitor services facility to a densely landscaped and treed area behind the Sylvan Theater. This facility was previously sited on axis with 15th Street and James Madison Drive in a highly conspicuous location that would have seriously detracted from the monument itself. In the new location, this facility, which also has been reduced in size, will not compete with the monument.

o Realignment of 15th Street. The existing S-curves are to be replaced with a gentle arc that reflects the contours of the hill supporting the monument and is almost symmetrical around the east-west axis of the mall. It is a much more respectful scheme than the earlier one which would have straightened out the center portion of the street and crossed the east-west axis as a rigid right-angled segment that was inappropriate to the character of the park land.

o The circle of trees that was to have surrounded the base has been replaced by a plain grass panel that is slightly raised so as to provide a low wall for sitting while visitors are waiting in line to enter the monument. Again this is much more in keeping with the simple elegance of the shaft.

o The relation of the lighting sources to the surrounding ring of flags will be adjusted to eliminate the shadows that occur on the sides of the monument in the present lighting scheme.

o The simplification of the pedestrian circulation paths around the north and south sides of the monument and the approaches from 15th Street are a big improvement and will give some sense of order to what is currently a very unplanned series of paths that for the most part have simply happened, rather than follow any kind of design. There may be some difficulty in enforcing the use of these paths and preventing short cuts, especially on the north side where there has been a path for years that connects the monument circle to the Sixteenth Street axis and the German-American Friendship Garden on Constitution Avenue. Once the parking lot is eliminated, one of the most commendable features of this new plan, it may be that the desire to make this connection will diminish to the point where people will simply not want to approach the monument from this direction. Let's wait and see what happens.

Again let me commend the Park Service on the long and thoughtful study it has given to this matter. This work will be a great improvement when completed and will be a most fitting setting for the signal federal monument in this country.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Robert Stanton, Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT K

31 January 1990

Dear Mr. DiSilvestre:

During its meeting of 18 January 1990, the Commission was pleased to discuss with you the phased alteration scheme for the 14th Street side of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The treatment of the required environmental facilities is addressed admirably by the proposed plaza which seems to dovetail neatly with the creation of a safer, more architecturally pleasing public entrance. While the members understand that these projects will be submitted for detailed review in the not-too-distant future, the Commission extends its current approval to Phase I of the project which is limited to a stone and wrought-iron fence proposed for the top of the existing one-story substation building in the courtyard between A and B wings.

One aspect of the overall proposal that bears further consideration, however, is the focus of Phase IV, the extension of the existing dining structure on the roof of B wing. Rather than asymmetrically truncated, as submitted to the Commission, the new roof should be hipped to reflect the main roof lines of both A and D wings.

As you know, the staff is available should questions arise concerning these comments and the nature of future submissions.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Anthony V. DiSilvestre
Departmental Environmental Programs Officer
Office of Management Support Systems
Department of the Treasury

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910
Pension Building, Suite 312
Judiciary Square
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-504-2200
202-504-2195 Fax

EXHIBIT K-1

8 March 1990

Dear Mr. DiSilvestre:

The staff has studied the working drawings for Phase II of the proposed renovation and alteration of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing provided by your office. The drawings comply with the concept design approved by the Commission during its meeting of 18 January 1990 and address the minor question of landscape material in a satisfactory manner. With this in mind, I see no reason to delay approval until the 15 March Commission meeting. Accordingly, the submission has been removed from the agenda and is considered approved.

The staff understands that Phases III and IV are still on the drawing board and will be submitted to the Commission at a later date. In the interim, please feel free to call should questions arise.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Anthony V. DiSilvestre
Departmental Environmental Programs Officer
Office of Management Support Systems
Department of the Treasury
Washington, D. C. 20220

EXHIBIT L

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 January 1990

NUMBER	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 90-52 HPA. 90-216	2346 & 2356 Massachusetts Ave.,NW Robert Haft Residence	Infill addition - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to general concept design for proposed infill structure attached to the existing residence at 2346 Massachusetts Avenue. Recommend replacing proposed brick and wrought iron ornamental fence at front of new structure with hedge and landscaping as a means of reinforcing the appearance of a separate residence. No objection to alteration of existing structure at 2356 Massachusetts Avenue. Submit working drawings and detailed landscape plans for permit review when ready.

S.L. 90-49	10 G Street, N.E. Square 677 Ltd. Part. 8 Story Office Building	New building - permit

ACTION: On HOLD until Commission meeting 15 February 1990.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

EXHIBIT M

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

14 December 1989

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Members of the Commission of Fine Arts

FROM: Charles H. Atherton, Secretary

SUBJECT: Shipstead-Luce Act and Georgetown Act Cases.

Enclosed are the appendices listing recommended actions for Commission approval, which were originally scheduled to be ratified at the Commission's meeting on 14 December. Because that meeting has been cancelled, and because the Commission has to act within a certain limited time period, I am circulating this list for your review and comment, so that we can return the actions to the District before time runs out.

Please indicate whether or not you approve, and return to us ASAP in the enclosed envelope.

	approve	disapprove
Shipstead-Luce Act appendix	_____	_____
Georgetown Act appendix	_____	_____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 90-01	4630 Broad Branch Road, N.W. Charles Cerf Residence	Alterations and rear addition - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case superseded by case S.L. 90-35.

S.L. 90-18	2801 Davenport Street, N.W. Dennis Blumer Residence	Fence railing on steps - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed wood railing at steps to the residence provided supports are not visible.

S.L. 90-24 HPA. 90-131	417 6th Street, N.W. Judiciary Plaza Ltd. Partnership 1st American Bank	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for refacing of existing sign.

S.L. 90-35	4630 Broad Branch Road, N.W. Charles Cerf Residence	Alterations and rear addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and rear addition.

S.L. 90-22	300 D Street, S.W. Washington Design Center Assoc.	Addition - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed addition over loading bay.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 90-37 HPA. 90-138 PADC 90-01	1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. The Oliver Carr Co. Chanel Boutique/Willard Hotel	Alterations and awnings - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed awnings and alterations.

S.L. 90-20	1801 Quincy Street, N.W. Ralph C. Taylor Residence	Additions - revised design - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for revised design of previously approved additions (See S.L. 88-31).

S.L. 90-21	5405 16th Street, N.W. Shirley D. Duhaney Residence	Rear addition - permit

ACTION: Recommend <u>against</u> issuance of permit for proposed rear addition which is out of character with the existing structure and, therefore, inappropriate.

S.L. 90-26	1706 Crestwood Drive, N.W. Pearl and George Dalley Residence	Addition - revised design - permit

ACTION: Request additional information clarifying conformance with previously approved design. Recommend <u>against</u> current design for roof deck which is intended for a sloping roof not previously approved by the Commission (See S.L. 88-28).

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

14 December 1989

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-09 HPA. 90-62	1505 35th Street, N.W. Mr. and Mrs. Roy Ryan Residence	Addition of 2nd floor sunroom - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed second floor glass enclosure of existing deck.

O.G. 90-19 HPA. 90-117 (See O.G. 89-189)	1409 29th Street, N.W. Jerome Springarn Residence	Rear alterations and 2nd floor bay window - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed second floor bay window and replacement of the existing doors and windows at the back of the residence as shown in the supplemental drawing received and dated 8 December 1989.

O.G. 90-22	3513 N Street, N.W. Holy Trinity Church	Alterations to steps - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations and repairs to steps.

O.G. 90-08 HPA. 90-48	1537 30th Street, N.W. Mrs. Fieldhouse Dodge House Condominium	Two skylights on roof - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed skylights.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-20 HPA. 90-119	3291 M Street, N.W. Las Pampas Restaurant	Awning - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed awning. The awning will not be back-lighted.

O.G. 90-17 HPA. 90-111	1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Thomas Jefferson Associates First American Bank	Sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for the installation of the proposed sign which is to consist of non-illuminated pin-mounted letters. It is understood that the existing signs will be removed upon installation of the new lettering.

O.G. 90-18 HPA. 90-116	3236 M Street, N.W. Clyde's Restaurant Group Clyde's Breakfast	Hanging sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for projecting sign at this location.

O.G. 90-16 HPA. 90-109	1338 29th Street, N.W. Janet Capazo Residence	Fence - permit

ACTION: Recommend <u>against</u> issuance of permit for proposed new fence which, with respect to the adjoining church property, would rise to approximately nine feet in height. Recommend resubmission of new design which, when measured from the church property, would be no greater than seven feet in height.

O.G. 90-21 HPA. 90-120	1606 32nd Street, N.W. Jeremy C. Ulin Residence	Repair in kind of brick pillar & fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for in kind repair of brick pillar and fence damaged by vandalism.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 90-15 HPA. 90-103	1647 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. David L. Dikerson Concord Cleaners	Sign - permit

ACTION: Recommend against issuance of permit for proposed sign. Recommend further studies for a hanging or pole-mounted sign.